

APPLICANT(S): Baruch et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/005,314  
FILED: December 7, 2001  
Page 5

### **REMARKS**

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 20 - 32 are pending in the application. Claims 20 - 32 have been rejected. Claims 20, 22, 25, 28 and 32 have been amended. Claims 27 and 29 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS**

#### **35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claim 22 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner commented that claims 27 and 29 do not list two engines specific to a non-dialing feature. Applicants have chosen to cancel these claims without prejudice. In making this cancellation without prejudice, Applicants reserve all rights in these claims to file divisional and/or continuation patent applications.

APPLICANT(S): Baruch et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/005,314  
FILED: December 7, 2001  
Page 6

### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 20 – 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Stammmler et al. (US 6,839,670) in view of Brown et al.

Claim 20 recites:

a feature command speech recognition unit to perform recognition of a user command requesting a non-dialing feature of said device; (claim 20, lines 2 - 3)

Stammmler et al. do not teach nor suggest performing speech recognition for non-dialing features. The addition of Brown et al. does not help because Brown et al. ties the choice of recognizer to the current prompt and not to a feature of the phone. In Table 1, Brown et al. lists a set of prompts and the recognizers that are associated with the prompts. All of the prompts are part of an airline reservation and information system, which may be considered a single feature. Thus, Brown et al. does not show:

“at least two speech recognition engines each specific to one non-dialing feature of the device to perform recognition on a voice input” (claim 20, lines 4 – 5)

A similar argument holds for claim 28. Neither Stammmler et al. nor Brown et al. show:

“at least two speech recognition engines each specific to one non-dialing feature of the device to perform recognition on a voice input” (claim 28, lines 2 – 3)

None of the speech recognition engines in Brown et al. or in Stammmler et al. are specific to a non-dialing feature of the device. Furthermore, neither Stammmler et al. nor Brown et al. teach or suggest having at least two speech recognition engines each specific to one non-dialing feature of the device.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent claims 20 and 28 are allowable. Claims 21 – 27 and 29 – 32 depend directly or indirectly from claims 20 and 28 and therefore include all the limitations of those claims. Therefore, Applicants

APPLICANT(S): Baruch et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/005,314  
FILED: December 7, 2001  
Page 7

respectfully assert that claims 21 – 27 and 29 – 32 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 20 - 32.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

**Petition For One-Month Extension Of Time Under 37 CFR 1.136(a)**

The period for responding to the Final Office Action and Advisory Action was set to expire on October 21, 2005. Applicant hereby requests that the period for responding be extended by one (1) month, so as to expire on November 21, 2005. Accordingly, this response is being timely filed.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account Number 501380 in the amount of sixty dollars (\$60.00) for the one-month extension fee for a small entity.

No additional fees are believed due. However, the United States Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account Number 501380 any amount which is necessary in connection with this filing.

APPLICANT(S): Baruch et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/005,314  
FILED: December 7, 2001  
Page 8

Favorable action on this response is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Daniel Swirsky', written in a cursive style.

Daniel J. Swirsky  
Agent for Applicant  
Registration No. 45,148

ALPHAPATENT ASSOCIATES LTD.  
55 REUVEN ST.  
BEIT SHEMESH, ISRAEL 99544  
TEL. (US) 516-620-4572  
FAX. (US) 206-374-6672  
EMAIL: [dswirsky@alphapatent.com](mailto:dswirsky@alphapatent.com)